

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-20 have been allowed. Claim 28 is hereby cancelled.

Claims 21, 23, 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,108,865, to Vesper et al. (Vesper). Claims 21-24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,046,279 (Rösler).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 21-27 is requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Rodriguez for the courtesies extended him at the interview on September 20, 2005.

During the interview, the amendments to claims 21 and 27 were discussed.

With respect to claim 21, it was noted that the tapering of one of the cooperating surfaces causes a frictional force generated between the surfaces to increase as the amount of axial overlap of the tubular elements increases. A common problem with this type of structure, particularly in the blower environment, is that the connection between the tubular elements tends to loosen over time. By reason of being able to increase the frictional holding force between these elements, a positive connection can be maintained over a substantial period of time.

It does not appear that either Rösler or Vesper is concerned with this problem or suggests any solution thereto. Rösler's structure provides for different axial dimensions for a container. The structure described therein is not intended to increase a holding force between the cooperating elements based on the degree of overlap, nor is this end of any significance to Rösler.

Similarly, Vesper does not appear to teach or suggest the advantages associated with a taper incorporated into telescopingly engaged elements.

While claim 26 was not specifically discussed during the interview, claim 26 incorporates the at least one tapered surface as in claim 21.

Claim 27 includes, among other limitations, a specific characterization of the projection. The projection is elongate with a length extending circumferentially. This structure potentially affords substantial stability between the cooperating elements, particularly as they are relatively pivoted.

Claims 22-25 each depends from claim 21 and recites further significant detail to further distinguish over the cited art.

Entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 21-27, and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Sept 30, 2005